

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

JUSTIN DONTAE EDWARDS, §
#1877410, §
§
Plaintiff, §
§
v. § Case No. 6:21-cv-489-JDK-KNM
§
BOBBY LUMPKIN, §
§
Defendant. §
§

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Justin Dontae Edwards filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging constitutional violations while he was a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition. Before the Court is Defendant Bobby Lumpkin's motion for summary judgment. Docket No. 21.

On January 10, 2023, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that the Court grant the summary judgment motion, finding that Plaintiff's lawsuit, which sought only injunctive relief, was rendered moot by Plaintiff's release from prison. Docket No. 22. A copy of this Report was mailed to Plaintiff, and Plaintiff has not filed objections.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and

Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 22) as the findings of this Court and **GRANTS** Defendant's summary judgment motion (Docket No. 21). It is therefore **ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 10th day of February, 2023.



JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE